

# **California Board of Registered Nursing**

## **2009-2010 Annual School Report**

---

Data Summary and Historical Trend Analysis

A Presentation of Pre-Licensure Nursing Education Programs in California

February 9, 2011

Prepared by:  
Tim Bates, MPP  
Dennis Keane, MPH  
Joanne Spetz, PhD  
Center for the Health Professions  
University of California, San Francisco  
3333 California Street, Suite 410  
San Francisco, CA 94118



## **PREFACE**

### **Nursing Education Survey Background**

Development of the 2009-2010 Board of Registered Nursing (BRN) School Survey was the work of the Board's Education Advisory Committee (EAC), which consists of nursing education stakeholders from across California. A list of the EAC members is included in the Appendices. The University of California, San Francisco was commissioned by the BRN to develop the online survey instrument, administer the survey, and report data collected from the survey.

Funding for this project was provided by the California Board of Registered Nursing.

### **Organization of Report**

The survey collects data about nursing programs and their students and faculty from August 1 through July 31. Annual data presented in this report represent August 1, 2009 through July 31, 2010. Demographic information and census data were requested for October 15, 2010.

Data from pre- and post-licensure nursing education programs are presented in separate reports and will be available on the BRN website. Data are presented in aggregate form and describe overall trends in the areas and over the times specified and, therefore, may not be applicable to individual nursing education programs.

Statistics for enrollments and completions represent two separate student populations. Therefore, it is not possible to directly compare enrollment and completion data.

Data collected for the first time on 2009-2010 survey are identified by the symbol (§). The reliability of these new data will be reviewed and considered for continued inclusion in future surveys.

### **Availability of Data**

The BRN Annual School Survey was designed to meet the data needs of the BRN as well as other interested organizations and agencies. A database with aggregate data derived from the 2000-2001 through 2009-2010 BRN School Surveys will be available for public access on the BRN website. Parties interested in accessing data not available on the website should contact the BRN.

The BRN acknowledges that survey respondents may not have had ready access to some of the data that were being requested. To address this issue, a member of the EAC developed a computer program for tracking most of the required data. The computer tracking program was distributed to nursing programs in the fall of 2006. Nursing programs that do not have this program may contact the BRN.

## Value of the Survey

This survey has been developed to support nursing, nursing education and workforce planning in California. The Board of Registered Nursing believes that the results of this survey will provide data-driven evidence to influence policy at the local, state, federal and institutional levels.

The BRN extends appreciation to the Education Advisory Committee and all survey respondents. Your participation has been vital to the success of this project.

## Survey Participation

All California nursing education programs were invited to participate in the survey. All of the 139 pre-licensure programs approved by the BRN to enroll students in 2009-2010 responded to the survey. A list of nursing programs that responded to the survey is provided in the Appendix.

Program Type	# Programs Responded	Total # Programs	Response Rate
ADN	77	77	100%
LVN to ADN	9	9	100%
BSN	37	37	100%
ELM	16	16	100%
Sum of Pre-Licensure Programs*	139	139	100%

\*Since some nursing schools admit students in more than one program, the number of nursing programs is greater than the number of nursing schools (n=125) in the state.

## DATA SUMMARY AND HISTORICAL TREND ANALYSIS

This analysis presents pre-licensure program data from the 2009-2010 BRN School Survey in comparison with data from previous years of the survey. Data items addressed include the number of nursing programs, enrollments, completions, retention rates, student and faculty census data, the use of clinical simulation by nursing programs, and clinical space and practice restrictions.

### Trends in Pre-Licensure Nursing Programs

#### *Number of Nursing Programs*

In 2009-2010, California had a total of 139 pre-licensure nursing programs. This represents a net increase of one nursing program since 2008-2009 (one new BSN program). Most pre-licensure nursing programs in California are public. However, the share of public programs has decreased from a high of 85.6% (n=83) of pre-licensure nursing programs in 2000-2001 to its current share of 75.5% (n=105) in 2009-2010. Since 2006-2007, private schools have accounted for all new program growth.

#### **Number of Nursing Programs**

	<i>Academic Year</i>									
	<i>2000-2001</i>	<i>2001-2002</i>	<i>2002-2003</i>	<i>2003-2004</i>	<i>2004-2005</i>	<i>2005-2006</i>	<i>2006-2007</i>	<i>2007-2008</i>	<i>2008-2009</i>	<i>2009-2010</i>
<b>Total # Nursing Programs</b>	<b>97</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>101</b>	<b>104</b>	<b>109</b>	<b>117</b>	<b>130</b>	<b>132</b>	<b>138</b>	<b>139</b>
ADN Programs	71	72	73	73	76	77	82	84	86	86
BSN Programs	22	23	23	23	24	26	32	32	36	37
ELM Programs	4	5	5	8	9	14	16	16	16	16
Public Programs	83	85	86	87	90	96	105	105	105	105
Private Programs	14	15	15	17	19	21	25	27	33	34

#### *Admission Spaces and New Student Enrollments*

In 2009-2010, programs reported almost the same number of admission spaces (n=12,797) available for new student enrollments as in 2008-2009 (n=12,812). These spaces were filled with a total of 14,228 students, which, again, represents approximately the same level of new student enrollment compared with the previous year (n=13,988). 47.5% of pre-licensure programs (n=66) reported that they filled more admission spaces than were available. The most frequently reported reasons for doing so were to account for attrition and to make use of grant or donor funding.<sup>‡</sup>

---

<sup>‡</sup> Data were collected for the first time in the 2009-2010 survey.

### Availability and Utilization of Admission Spaces

	<i>Academic Year</i>									
	<i>2000-2001</i>	<i>2001-2002</i>	<i>2002-2003</i>	<i>2003-2004</i>	<i>2004-2005</i>	<i>2005-2006</i>	<i>2006-2007</i>	<i>2007-2008</i>	<i>2008-2009</i>	<i>2009-2010</i>
Spaces Available	6,610	6,719	7,601	7,797	9,026	10,523	11,475	11,773	12,812	12,797
New Student Enrollments	6,128	6,422	7,457	7,825	8,926	11,131	12,709	12,961	13,988	14,228
% Spaces Filled	92.7%	95.6%	98.1%	100.4%	98.9%	105.8%	110.8%	110.1%	109.2%	111.2%

Nursing programs continue to receive more applications requesting entrance into their programs than can be accommodated. There was a 12.6% (n=4,594) increase in the number of qualified applications nursing schools received between 2008-2009 and 2009-2010. In 2009-2010, 65.4% (n=26,877) of qualified applications to California nursing education programs were not accepted for admission. Since these data represent applications and an individual can apply to multiple nursing programs, the number of applications is likely greater than the number of individuals applying for admission to nursing programs in California.

### Student Admission Applications\*

	<i>Academic Year</i>									
	<i>2000-2001</i>	<i>2001-2002</i>	<i>2002-2003</i>	<i>2003-2004</i>	<i>2004-2005</i>	<i>2005-2006</i>	<i>2006-2007</i>	<i>2007-2008</i>	<i>2008-2009</i>	<i>2009-2010</i>
<b>Qualified Applications</b>	<b>10,021</b>	<b>10,362</b>	<b>13,926</b>	<b>17,887</b>	<b>20,405</b>	<b>28,410</b>	<b>28,506</b>	<b>33,746</b>	<b>36,511</b>	<b>41,105</b>
ADN	6,924	7,554	9,531	12,585	14,615	19,724	19,559	25,021	26,185	28,555
BSN	2,635	2,413	3,301	3,964	4,914	7,391	7,004	7,187	8,142	10,151
ELM	462	395	1,094	1,338	876	1,295	1,943	1,538	2,184	2,399
% Qualified Applications Not Accepted	38.8%	38.0%	46.5%	56.3%	56.3%	60.8%	55.4%	61.0%	61.7%	65.4%

\*Since these data represent applications rather than individuals, the increase in qualified applications may not represent an equal growth in the number of individuals applying to nursing school.

Since 2000-2001, new student enrollments have more than doubled (n=8,100). However, the rate of new student enrollment growth has been slowing in recent years. The number of students who enrolled in a nursing program in California increased very slightly by 1.7% (n=240), from 13,988 in 2008-2009 to 14,228 in 2009-2010. New student enrollments in ADN programs fell 8.7% (n=818), but increased by 26.7% in BSN programs (n=1,021). In addition, new student enrollments in public programs fell by 5.8% (n=593), but increased 22.1% in private programs (n=833).

### New Student Enrollment by Program Type

	<i>Academic Year</i>									
	<i>2000-2001</i>	<i>2001-2002</i>	<i>2002-2003</i>	<i>2003-2004</i>	<i>2004-2005</i>	<i>2005-2006</i>	<i>2006-2007</i>	<i>2007-2008</i>	<i>2008-2009</i>	<i>2009-2010</i>
<b>New Student Enrollment</b>	<b>6,128</b>	<b>6,422</b>	<b>7,457</b>	<b>7,825</b>	<b>8,926</b>	<b>11,131</b>	<b>12,709</b>	<b>12,961</b>	<b>13,988</b>	<b>14,228</b>
ADN	4,236	4,558	5,316	5,547	6,160	7,778	8,899	8,847	9,412	8,594
BSN	1,732	1,677	1,903	1,960	2,371	2,709	3,110	3,404	3,821	4,842
ELM	160	187	238	318	395	644	700	710	755	792
Private	951	884	980	1,150	1,614	2,024	2,384	2,704	3,774	4,607
Public	5,177	5,538	6,477	6,675	7,312	9,107	10,325	10,257	10,214	9,621

## Student Completions

RN programs continue to graduate more students every year. However, as with new student enrollments, the rate of increase is slowing down. In 2009-2010, the number of students who completed a nursing program in California increased by 8.9% (n=942) over the previous year. This is compared with a 10.3% (n=990) increase in new graduates between 2007-2008 and 2008-2009, and a 15.2% (n=1,263) increase between 2006-2007 and 2007-2008. 66.8% of students completing a nursing program do so through an ADN program.

### Student Completions

	<i>Academic Year</i>									
	<i>2000-2001</i>	<i>2001-2002</i>	<i>2002-2003</i>	<i>2003-2004</i>	<i>2004-2005</i>	<i>2005-2006</i>	<i>2006-2007</i>	<i>2007-2008</i>	<i>2008-2009</i>	<i>2009-2010</i>
<b>Student Completions</b>	<b>5,178</b>	<b>5,346</b>	<b>5,623</b>	<b>6,158</b>	<b>6,677</b>	<b>7,528</b>	<b>8,317</b>	<b>9,580</b>	<b>10,570</b>	<b>11,512</b>
ADN	3,799	3,826	4,027	4,488	4,769	5,351	5,885	6,527	7,119	7,690
BSN	1,277	1,394	1,412	1,479	1,664	1,861	2,074	2,481	2,788	3,157
ELM	102	126	184	191	244	316	358	572	663	665

## Retention and Attrition Rates

Of the 10,180 students scheduled to complete a nursing program in the 2009-2010 academic year, 77.1% (n=7,845) completed the program on-time, 9.1% (n=925) are still enrolled in the program, and 13.9% (n=1,410) dropped out or were disqualified from the program. The retention rate has steadily increased over the past decade, from a low of 66.2% in 2000-2001 to the current high of 77.1% in 2009-2010.

### Student Retention and Attrition

	<i>Academic Year</i>									
	<i>2000-2001</i>	<i>2001-2002</i>	<i>2002-2003</i>	<i>2003-2004</i>	<i>2004-2005</i>	<i>2005-2006</i>	<i>2006-2007</i>	<i>2007-2008</i>	<i>2008-2009</i>	<i>2009-2010</i>
<b>Students Scheduled to Complete the Program</b>	<b>8,478</b>	<b>6,806</b>	<b>8,208</b>	<b>8,151</b>	<b>8,507</b>	<b>8,208</b>	<b>8,852</b>	<b>9,769</b>	<b>10,630</b>	<b>10,180</b>
Completed On Time	5,610	4,553	5,621	5,831	6,055	6,047	6,437	7,254	7,990	7,845
Still Enrolled	1,372	1,184	1,314	1,082	710	849	996	950	1,078	925
Attrition	1,496	1,069	1,273	1,238	1,742	1,312	1,419	1,565	1,562	1,410
Completed Late <sup>‡</sup>										615
<b>Retention Rate*</b>	66.2%	66.9%	68.5%	71.5%	71.2%	73.7%	72.7%	74.3%	75.2%	77.1%
<b>Attrition Rate</b>	17.6%	15.7%	15.5%	15.2%	20.5%	16.0%	16.0%	16.0%	14.7%	13.9%
<b>% Still Enrolled</b>	16.2%	17.4%	16.0%	13.3%	8.3%	10.3%	11.3%	9.7%	10.1%	9.1%

\*Retention rate = (students who completed the program on-time) / (students scheduled to complete the program)

<sup>‡</sup> Data were collected for the first time in the 2009-2010 survey. These completions are not included in the calculation of either the retention or attrition rates.

Attrition rates vary by program type. In 2009-2010, attrition rates in ADN and BSN programs dropped slightly, while the attrition rate increased in ELM programs from 5.2% to 8.3%. Attrition rates are higher in public nursing programs than in private programs, 15.1% compared to 8.9%; however, there was a decline in attrition rates in both public and private nursing programs this year.

### Attrition Rates by Program Type

Program Type	Academic Year									
	2000-2001	2001-2002	2002-2003	2003-2004	2004-2005	2005-2006	2006-2007	2007-2008	2008-2009	2009-2010
ADN	21.5%	16.9%	19.1%	17.0%	23.7%	18.3%	19.0%	19.0%	17.6%	16.6%
BSN	9.0%	14.0%	8.1%	10.8%	11.0%	10.5%	8.7%	8.6%	9.0%	8.1%
ELM	3.3%	1.2%	3.2%	4.7%	14.3%	5.0%	7.2%	5.6%	5.2%	8.3%
Private	11.7%	12.0%	9.6%	10.1%	15.9%	14.6%	7.9%	9.2%	10.0%	8.9%
Public	18.8%	16.5%	16.7%	15.9%	21.2%	16.2%	17.7%	17.5%	16.0%	15.1%

Retention and attrition rates have fluctuated over the nine-year period documented in the above tables. Changes to the survey that occurred between 2003-2004 and 2005-2006 may have affected the comparability of these data over time.

### Student Census Data

The total number of students enrolled in California nursing programs on October 15, 2010 increased very slightly by comparison with the previous year, from 25,285 to 25,719. This increase is the result of more BSN students, whose total numbers grew by 15.2% (n=1,349) between 2009 and 2010. Of the total student body in California's pre-license nursing programs, 54.5% (n=14,011) were in ADN programs, 39.8% (n=10,242) in BSN programs, and 5.7% (n=1,466) in ELM programs.

### Student Census Data\*

Program Type	Year									
	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
ADN Program	8,236	8,999	9,547	9,939	11,117	12,632	14,191	14,304	14,987	14,011
BSN Program		4,235	4,254	5,279	5,669	6,285	6,799	7,956	8,893	10,242
ELM Program		190	148	368	804	659	896	1,290	1,405	1,466
<b>Total Nursing Students</b>	<b>12,661</b>	<b>13,401</b>	<b>15,194</b>	<b>16,412</b>	<b>18,061</b>	<b>20,327</b>	<b>22,524</b>	<b>23,550</b>	<b>25,285</b>	<b>25,719</b>

\*Census data represent the number of students on October 15<sup>th</sup> of the given year. Blank cells indicated that the applicable information was not requested in the given year.

### *Clinical Simulation in Nursing Education*

Between 8/1/09 and 7/31/10, 116 of California's 125 nursing schools reported using clinical simulation<sup>1</sup>. Of the remaining nine schools not using clinical simulations, one began using clinical simulation since 7/31/10. An additional six schools reported plans to start using simulation in the next year.

The most frequently reported reasons for why schools used a clinical simulation center in 2009-2010 were to provide clinical experience not available in a clinical setting, to standardize clinical experiences, and to check clinical competencies. Of the 116 schools that used clinical simulation centers in 2009-2010, 72.4% (n=84) plan to expand the center.

<b>Reasons for Using a Clinical Simulation Center*</b>	<b>2007-2008</b>	<b>2008-2009</b>	<b>2009-2010</b>
To provide clinical experience not available in a clinical setting	73.5%	70.3%	85.1%
To standardize clinical experiences	80.9%	75.7%	82.5%
To check clinical competencies	69.1%	73.9%	80.7%
To make up for clinical experiences	55.9%	56.8%	62.2%
To increase capacity in your nursing program	22.1%	14.4%	13.8%
Number of schools that use a clinical simulation center	68	111	116

\*These data were collected for the first time in 2006-2007. However, changes in these questions for the 2007-2008 administration of the survey and lack of confidence in the reliability of the 2006-2007 data prevent comparability of the data. Therefore, data prior to 2007-2008 are not shown.

### *Clinical Space & Clinical Practice Restrictions<sup>‡</sup>*

77 programs reported being denied access to clinical placement sites in 2009-2010 that had been available during the 2008-2009 academic year, affecting a total of 2,312 students. Overall, the most frequently reported reasons for why programs were denied clinical space were competition for space arising from an increase in the number of nursing students in the region, and being displaced by another program.

<b>Reasons for Clinical Space Being Unavailable</b>	<b>Program Type</b>				
	ADN	LVN to ADN	BSN	ELM	Total
	%	%	%	%	%
Competition for Clinical Space due to Increase in Number of Nursing Students in Region	62.2%	80.0%	77.8%	100%	71.4%
Displaced by Another Program	57.8%	80.0%	61.1%	77.8%	62.3%
Staff Nurse Overload	44.4%	60.0%	72.2%	66.7%	54.5%
Clinical Facility Seeking Magnet Status	44.4%	80.0%	16.7%	11.1%	36.4%
Decrease in Patient Census	31.1%	40.0%	55.6%	11.1%	35.1%
Nursing Residency Programs	26.7%	40.0%	33.3%	22.2%	28.6%
No Longer Accepting ADN Students	37.8%	60.0%	0.0%	0.0%	26.0%
Other	24.4%	20.0%	11.1%	22.2%	20.8%
Number of programs	45	5	18	9	77

<sup>1</sup> Clinical simulation provides a simulated real-time nursing care experience using clinical scenarios and low to hi-fidelity mannequins, which allow students to integrate, apply, and refine specific skills and abilities that are based on theoretical concepts and scientific knowledge. It may include videotaping, de-briefing and dialogue as part of the learning process.

<sup>‡</sup> Data were collected for the first time in the 2009-2010 survey.



94 schools reported that pre-licensure students in their programs had encountered restrictions to clinical practice imposed on them by clinical facilities. The most common types of restricted access students faced were to the clinical site itself, due to a visit from the Joint Commission or another accrediting agency, access to electronic medical records, and bar coding medication administration. Schools reported that it was uncommon to have students face restrictions on direct communication with health care team members, access to alternative settings due to liability issues, and IV medication administration.

Type of Restricted Access	Percentage of Schools (%)					# Schools
	Very Uncommon	Uncommon	Common	Very Common	N/A	
Bar coding medication administration	8.5%	17.0%	39.4%	30.9%	4.3%	94
Electronic Medical Records	7.5%	19.2%	39.4%	30.9%	3.2%	94
Glucometers	21.1%	34.4%	18.9%	20.0%	5.6%	90
Automated medical supply cabinets	10.8%	21.5%	30.0%	23.7%	16.1%	93
IV medication administration	20.7%	44.6%	16.3%	12.0%	6.5%	92
Clinical site due to visit from accrediting agency (Joint Commission)	6.5%	22.8%	34.8%	34.8%	1.1%	92
Direct communication with health team	36.6%	45.2%	6.5%	5.4%	6.5%	93
Alternative setting due to liability	28.6%	30.8%	13.2%	7.7%	19.8%	91

### *Faculty Census Data*

The total number of nursing faculty increased by 3.1% (n=111) over the last year. On October 15, 2010, there were 3,741 total nursing faculty. Of these faculty, 38.4% (n=1,435) were full-time and 61.6% (n=2,306) were part-time.

The need for faculty continues to outpace the number of active faculty. On October 15, 2010, there were 196 vacant faculty positions. These vacancies represent a 5.0% faculty vacancy rate.

### **Faculty Census Data<sup>1</sup>**

	Year									
	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005 <sup>*2</sup>	2006*	2007*	2008	2009	2010
<b>Total Faculty</b>	<b>1,840</b>	<b>1,957</b>	<b>2,031</b>	<b>2,207</b>	<b>2,432</b>	<b>2,723</b>	<b>3,282</b>	<b>3,471</b>	<b>3,630</b>	<b>3,741</b>
Full-time	1,047	1,090	1,087	1,061	930	1,102	1,374	1,402	1,453	1,435
Part-time	793	867	944	1,146	959	1,619	1,896	2,069	2,177	2,306
<b>Vacancy Rate**</b>		<b>4.1%</b>	<b>5.9%</b>	<b>3.7%</b>	<b>6.0%</b>	<b>6.6%</b>	<b>5.9%</b>	<b>4.7%</b>	<b>4.7%</b>	<b>5.0%</b>
Vacancies		83	128	84	154	193	206	172	181	196

\*The sum of full- and part-time faculty did not equal the total faculty reported in these years.

\*\*Vacancy rate = number of vacancies/(total faculty + number of vacancies)

1 - Census data represent the number of faculty on October 15<sup>th</sup> of the given year.

2 - Faculty vacancies were estimated based on the vacant FTEs reported.

## *Summary*

Over the past decade, the number of California pre-licensure nursing programs has grown by 43.3%, from 97 programs in 2000-2001 to 139 programs in 2009-2010. During this period new student enrollments have more than doubled. California's pre-licensure nursing programs enrolled over 14,000 new students in 2009-2010. Although both admission spaces and new student enrollments have grown, data indicate that the rate of enrollment growth has stabilized. For the past four years enrollment growth has been slowly declining. Enrollment growth peaked at 24.7% in 2005-2006 and has been followed by four consecutive years of slower growth: 14.2% in 2006-2007, 2.0% in 2007-2008, 7.9% in 2008-2009 and 1.7% growth in 2009-2010. This stabilization of enrollment growth since 2005-2006 most likely signifies a new trend in nursing program expansion in California.

In 2009-2010, pre-licensure RN programs reported 11,512 completions, more than double the 5,178 completions reported in 2000-2001. Despite the overall increase in graduates and the highest statewide retention rate (77.1%) in ten years, the new graduate growth rate in 2009-2010 was much smaller by comparison with previous years; 10.5% in 2006-2007, 15.2% in 2007-2008, 10.3% in 2008-2009 and 8.9% in 2009-2010. As the rate of enrollment growth stabilizes and if the statewide retention rate remains at current levels, it is likely that the number of graduates from California nursing programs will also stabilize.

Clinical simulation has become widespread in nursing education. It is seen by schools as an important tool for providing clinical experiences that are otherwise not available to students, and for standardizing students' clinical experiences and monitoring clinical competencies. The importance of clinical simulation is underscored by data collected for the first time in the 2009-2010 survey, which show that 55% of programs (n=77) were denied access to clinical placement sites that were previously available to them. In addition, 75% of schools (n=94) reported that their students had faced restrictions to specific types of clinical practice during the 2009-2010 academic year.

Expansion in RN education has required nursing programs to hire more faculty to teach the growing number of students. Although the number of nursing faculty has almost doubled in the past ten years, from 1,840 in 2001 to 3,741 in 2010, faculty hires have not kept pace with the growth in California pre-licensure nursing programs. In 2009-2010, 196 faculty vacancies were reported, representing a faculty vacancy rate of 5.0%, which is slightly higher than in 2008-2009 (4.7%). Although this is one of the lowest reported rates over the past six years, a shortage of faculty remains one of the key obstacles to RN program expansion.

## APPENDICES

### APPENDIX A – List of Survey Respondents by Degree Program

#### *ADN Programs (77)*

American River College	Los Angeles Southwest College
Antelope Valley College	Los Angeles Trade-Tech College
Bakersfield College	Los Angeles Valley College
Butte Community College	Los Medanos College
Cabrillo College	Mendocino College
Cerritos College	Merced College
Chabot College	Merritt College
Chaffey College	Mira Costa College ( <i>formerly LVN to ADN</i> )
Citrus College	Modesto Junior College
City College of San Francisco	Monterey Peninsula College
College of Marin	Moorpark College
College of San Mateo	Mount Saint Mary's College
College of the Canyons	Mount San Antonio College
College of the Desert	Mount San Jacinto College
College of the Redwoods	Napa Valley College
College of the Sequoias	Ohlone College
Contra Costa College	Pacific Union College
Copper Mountain College	Palomar College
Cuesta College	Pasadena City College
Cypress College	Rio Hondo College
De Anza College	Riverside Community College
East Los Angeles College	Sacramento City College
El Camino College - Compton Education Center	Saddleback College
El Camino College	San Bernardino Valley College
Everest College	San Diego City College
Evergreen Valley College	San Joaquin Delta College
Fresno City College	San Joaquin Valley College
Glendale Community College	Santa Ana College
Golden West College	Santa Barbara City College
Grossmont College	Santa Monica College
Hartnell College	Santa Rosa Junior College
Imperial Valley College	Shasta College
Kaplan College ( <i>formerly Maric College</i> )	Sierra College
Long Beach City College	Solano Community College
Los Angeles City College	Southwestern College
Los Angeles County College of Nursing & Allied Health	Ventura College
Los Angeles Harbor College	Victor Valley College
Los Angeles Pierce College	West Hills College Lemoore
	Yuba College

*LVN to ADN Programs Only (9)*

Allan Hancock College  
Carrington College  
(formerly *Western Career College – Sacramento*)  
College of the Siskiyous  
Gavilan College

Mission College  
Unitek College  
West Coast University – Inland Empire  
West Coast University – Los Angeles  
West Coast University – Orange

*BSN Programs (37)*

American University of Health Sciences  
Azusa Pacific University  
Biola University  
California Baptist University  
Concordia University Irvine  
CSU Bakersfield  
CSU Channel Islands  
CSU Chico  
CSU East Bay  
CSU Fresno  
CSU Fullerton  
CSU Long Beach  
CSU Los Angeles  
CSU Northridge  
CSU Sacramento  
CSU San Bernardino  
CSU San Marcos  
CSU Stanislaus  
Dominican University of California

Humboldt State University  
Loma Linda University  
Mount Saint Mary's College  
National University  
Point Loma Nazarene University  
Samuel Merritt University  
San Diego State University  
San Francisco State University  
San Jose State University  
Sonoma State University  
University of California Irvine  
University of California Los Angeles  
University of Phoenix - Northern California  
University of San Francisco  
West Coast University – Inland Empire  
\* West Coast University – Los Angeles  
West Coast University – Orange County  
Western Governors University

*ELM Programs (16)*

Azusa Pacific University  
California Baptist University  
CSU Dominguez Hills  
CSU Fresno  
CSU Fullerton  
CSU Long Beach  
CSU Los Angeles  
United States University  
(formerly *InterAmerican College*)

Samuel Merritt University  
San Francisco State University  
Sonoma State University  
University of California Los Angeles  
University of California San Francisco  
University of San Diego  
University of San Francisco  
Western University of Health Sciences

\* - New programs in 2009-2010

## APPENDIX B – BRN Education Advisory Committee Members

### **BRN Education Advisory Committee Members**

#### **Members**

Loucine Huckabay, Chair  
 Sue Albert  
 Audrey Berman  
 Liz Close  
 Patricia Girczyc  
 Marilyn Herrmann  
 Deloras Jones  
 Stephanie Leach  
 Tammy Rice, MSN, RN  
 Scott R. Ziehm, ND, RN

#### **Organization**

California State University, Long Beach  
 College of the Canyons  
 Samuel Merritt University  
 Sonoma State University  
 College of the Redwoods  
 Loma Linda University  
 California Institute of Nursing and Health Care  
 formerly with California Community College Chancellor's Office  
 Saddleback College  
 University of California, San Francisco

#### **Ex-Officio Members**

Louise Bailey                      California Board of Registered Nursing

#### **Project Managers**

Carol Mackay                      California Board of Registered Nursing  
 Julie Campbell-Warnock        California Board of Registered Nursing